



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/199,566	11/25/1998	HIROYUKI SAITO	981391	3839

23850 7590 08/15/2003

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP
1725 K STREET, NW
SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

ROSEN, NICHOLAS D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3625

DATE MAILED: 08/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/199,566

Applicant(s)

SAITO ET AL.

Examiner

Nicholas D. Rosen

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11/25/98 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Claims 1-40 have been examined.

Request for Continued Examination

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 19, 2003 has been entered.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the fifteenth line of claim 1, "monitoring the applicant at a remote site" is unclear, because it leaves open what the site is remote from. It would be preferable to write "monitoring the applicant at the passport transaction apparatus" (which is remote from the center). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the fifteenth line of claim 2, "monitoring the applicant at a remote site" is unclear, because it leaves open what the site is remote from. It would be preferable to write "monitoring the applicant at the passport transaction apparatus" (which is remote from the center). Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 3-13 are objected to because of the following informalities: In the sixteenth line of claim 3, "monitoring the applicant at a remote site" is unclear, because it leaves open what the site is remote from. It would be preferable to write "monitoring the applicant at the passport transaction apparatus" (which is remote from the center). Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 14-25 are objected to because of the following informalities: In the fifteenth line of claim 14, "monitoring the applicant at a remote site" is unclear, because it leaves open what the site is remote from. It would be preferable to write "monitoring the applicant at the passport transaction apparatus" (which is remote from the center). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 27 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the eighth line of claim 27, "reading out data" should be either "reading out of data" or "step of reading out data". Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 28-32 are objected to because of the following informalities: In the seventh line of claim 28, the word "comprises" should be followed by a colon. Preferably, succeeding clauses should be doubly indented as needed, to indicate what is comprised by the passport transaction apparatus as well as the passport transaction system. In the ninth line of claim 28, the first occurrence of "the applicant" should be "an applicant" to avoid antecedent basis problems.

Claims 33-37 are objected to because of the following informalities: In the tenth line of claim 33, reference is made to "the applicant" and then, later in the line, to "an

applicant". These should be reversed to avoid antecedent basis problems. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 40 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the fifth line of claim 40, "an image output unit monitoring an applicant" is recited, and in the twelfth line, claim 40 recites, "wherein the image input unit is also used for monitoring the applicant at a remote site." The second limitation is to be redundant and unnecessary, if it is merely referring to the same unit doing the same thing. If the image input unit is also monitoring the applicant at a remote site, distinct from its monitoring of the applicant, it is necessary to distinguish the two more clearly, and point to proper support in the specification and drawings for the two kinds of monitoring. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe (U.S. Patent 5,717,776) in view of Sukegawa et al. (U.S. Patent 5,235,165), "MASTERCARD: Competing Banks Collaborate during First Implementation of SET Interoperability" (hereinafter "Competing Banks"), and official notice. Watanabe discloses an identification document transaction apparatus connected to a residents database storing therein identification data of the residents and also connected to a center which executes an examination for issuance of identification documents through a communication line, said apparatus comprising: a communication unit for communicating with said center (column 12, lines 31-33; see also Figure 10A); an image input unit for inputting an image of the applicant for an identification document (column 15, lines 1-31); and a data input unit for inputting data for the application (column 15, lines 21-40).

Watanabe does not expressly disclose a display unit for displaying a guidance for the procedure for the identification document transaction, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (Figure 7; column 3, lines 21-24; column 8, lines 27-35 et subseq.). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to include a display unit for displaying a guidance for the procedure, for the obvious advantage of making applicants more likely to carry out the procedure correctly.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose a sign input unit for inputting a sign of the applicant, but official notice is taken that it is well known to use sign input units for inputting a sign of an applicant. (For example, Examiner inputted his signature into such a unit to have a reproduction of his signature printed on his Virginia driver's license.) Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to include such a sign input unit, for the obvious advantage of obtaining the identification document applicant's signature for the identification document and/or for issuer's records.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose a control section for transmitting the data inputted by each of the input units to the center using the communication unit, but it is held to be inherent that there must be circuitry and/or software to carry this out. Watanabe does not expressly disclose orchestrating the center so as to determine whether the applied for identification document is to be issued or not based on the identification data for the applicant which has been recorded in the resident database and on the transmitted input data, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (column 7, line 36, through column 8, line 26; see also Figure 4). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to determine whether or not the applied for identification document is to be issued or not based on the recorded identification data and the transmitted input data, for the obvious advantage of issuing identification documents to and only to the persons whom they are supposed to identify.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose that his invention is for passports, but does teach that it relates to a certification card with a certification photo, such as a driver's license or a personal identification card (column 1, lines 7-9), and passports are personal identification documents which generally contain certification photos. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to apply Watanabe's methods to producing passports.

Watanabe does not disclose that the passport transaction apparatus is connected to a financial institution such as a bank or credit card company that executes an authorization of the passport applicant, so that the passport transaction apparatus identifies the applicant based on a result of the authentication, but it is standard procedure to have purchasing apparatus connected to a financial apparatus, such as a credit card company, that executes an authentication of the applicant, so that the transaction apparatus identifies a purchaser based on the result of the authentication, as taught by "Competing Banks" (especially the paragraph beginning "Mr. Roland Cheung"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of patent applicant's invention to apply these standard techniques to a passport transaction apparatus in particular, for the obvious advantage of determining or verifying a passport applicant's identity.

Watanabe does not disclose that the image input unit is also used for monitoring the applicant at a remote site, but official notice is taken that it is well known to use image input units (e.g., security cameras) to monitor people remotely. Hence, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of patent applicant's invention to have the image input unit also be used for monitoring the passport applicant at a remote site, for such obvious advantages as assisting the passport applicant in applying for a passport correctly, and assuring that the passport applicant does not steal any valuables available at the remote site. Furthermore, the mere recitation of an intended use does not make known apparatus patentable.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe (U.S. Patent 5,717,776) in view of Sukegawa et al (U.S. Patent 5,235,165), "MASTERCARD: Competing Banks Collaborate during First Implementation of SET Interoperability" (hereinafter "Competing Banks"), and official notice. Watanabe discloses an identification document transaction apparatus connected through a communication line to a center which executes an examination for issuance of identification documents, as well as to a residents database which stores identification data of residents for providing services for issuing identification documents to residents, said apparatus comprising: a communication unit for communicating with said center (column 12, lines 31-33; see also Figure 10A); an image input unit for inputting an image of the applicant for an identification document (column 15, lines 1-31); and a data input unit for inputting data of the application (column 15, lines 21-40). Watanabe does not expressly disclose a control unit for transmitting the data inputted by each of the input units and the identification data of the applicant fetched using the communication unit to the center using the communication unit, but it is held to be inherent that there

must be circuitry and/or software to carry this out. Watanabe does not expressly disclose orchestrating the center so as to determine whether the applied for identification document is to be issued or not based on the identification data for the applicant which has been recorded in the resident database and on the transmitted input data, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (column 7, line 36, through column 8, line 26; see also Figure 4). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to determine whether or not the applied for identification document is to be issued or not based on the recorded identification data and the transmitted input data, for the obvious advantage of issuing identification documents to and only to the persons whom they are supposed to identify.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose a display unit for displaying a guidance for the procedure for the identification document transaction, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (Figure 7; column 3, lines 21-24; column 8, lines 27-35 et subseq.). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to include a display unit for displaying a guidance for the procedure, for the obvious advantage of making applicants more likely to carry out the procedure correctly.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose a sign input unit for inputting a sign of the applicant, but official notice is taken that it is well known to use sign input units for inputting a sign of an applicant. (For example, Examiner inputted his signature into such a unit to have a reproduction of his signature printed on his Virginia driver's

license.) Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to include such a sign input unit, for the obvious advantage of obtaining the identification document applicant's signature for the identification document and/or for issuer's records.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose that his invention is for passports, but does teach that it relates to a certification card with a certification photo, such as a driver's license or a personal identification card (column 1, lines 7-9), and passports are personal identification documents which generally contain certification photos. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to apply Watanabe's methods to producing passports.

Watanabe does not disclose that the passport transaction apparatus is connected to a financial institution such as a bank or credit card company that executes an authorization of the passport applicant, so that the passport transaction apparatus identifies the applicant based on a result of the authentication, but it is standard procedure to have purchasing apparatus connected to a financial apparatus, such as a credit card company, that executes an authentication of the applicant, so that the transaction apparatus identifies the applicant based on the result of the authentication, as taught by "Competing Banks" (especially paragraph beginning "Mr. Roland Cheung"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of patent applicant's invention to apply these standard

techniques to a passport transaction apparatus in particular, for the obvious advantage of determining or verifying a passport applicant's identity.

Watanabe does not disclose that the image input unit is also used for monitoring the applicant at a remote site, but official notice is taken that it is well known to use image input units (e.g., security cameras) to monitor people remotely. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of patent applicant's invention to have the image input unit also be used for monitoring the passport applicant at a remote site, for such obvious advantages as assisting the passport applicant in applying for a passport correctly, and assuring that the passport applicant does not steal any valuables available at the remote site. Furthermore, the mere recitation of an intended use does not make known apparatus patentable.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe (U.S. Patent 5,717,776) in view of Sukegawa et al. (U.S. Patent 5,235,165), "MASTERCARD: Competing Banks Collaborate during First Implementation of SET Interoperability" (hereinafter "Competing Banks"), and official notice. Watanabe discloses an identification document apparatus which provides the data for issuance of a certificate for an applicant and executes examination for issuance of identification documents for processing identification documents through communication with the center via a communication line, said apparatus comprising: a communication unit for communicating with said center (column 12, lines 31-33; see also Figure 10A); an image input unit for inputting an image of the applicant for an identification document

(column 15, lines 1-31); and a data input unit for inputting data for the identification document transaction (column 15, lines 21-40). Watanabe does not expressly disclose a control unit for controlling the communications by the communication unit, image input by the image input unit, display by the display unit, data input by the data input unit, and issuance by the issuer unit, but it is held to be inherent that there must be circuitry and/or software to carry out control. Watanabe does not expressly disclose orchestrating the center so as to determine whether the applied for identification document is to be issued or not based on the identification data for the applicant which has been recorded in the resident database and on the transmitted input data, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (column 7, line 36, through column 8, line 26; see also Figure 4). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to determine whether or not the applied for identification document is to be issued or not based on the recorded identification data and the transmitted input data, for the obvious advantage of issuing identification documents to and only to the persons whom they are supposed to identify.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose a display unit for displaying a guidance for the identification document transaction, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (Figure 7; column 3, lines 21-24; column 8, lines 27-35 et subseq.). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to include a display unit for displaying a guidance for the

procedure, for the obvious advantage of making applicants more likely to carry out the procedure correctly.

Watanabe discloses a printer unit (Figure 2, element 57; see also column 5, lines 9-12). Watanabe does not expressly disclose that the printer unit prints the image inputted by the image input unit, but official notice is taken that it is well known to print images on passports, driver's licenses, passports, and other identification documents. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to print the image, for the obvious advantage of producing a photographic identification document.

Watanabe discloses an issuer unit for issuing an identification document obtained by printing with the printer unit (column 16, lines 35-39).

Watanabe does not expressly disclose that his invention is for passports, but does teach that it relates to a certification card with a certification photo, such as a driver's license or a personal identification card (column 1, lines 7-9), and passports are personal identification documents which generally contain certification photos. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to apply Watanabe's methods to producing passports.

Watanabe does not disclose that the passport transaction apparatus is connected to a financial institution such as a bank or credit card company that executes an authorization of the passport applicant, so that the passport transaction apparatus identifies the applicant based on a result of the authentication, but it is standard

procedure to have purchasing apparatus connected to a financial apparatus, such as a credit card company, that executes an authentication of a purchaser, so that the transaction apparatus identifies the applicant based on the result of the authentication, as taught by "Competing Banks" (see especially paragraph beginning "Mr. Roland Cheung"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of patent applicant's invention to apply these standard techniques to a passport transaction apparatus in particular, for the obvious advantage of determining or verifying a passport applicant's identity.

Watanabe does not disclose that the image input unit is also used for monitoring the applicant at a remote site, but official notice is taken that it is well known to use image input units (e.g., security cameras) to monitor people remotely. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of patent applicant's invention to have the image input unit also be used for monitoring the passport applicant at a remote site, for such obvious advantages as assisting the passport applicant in applying for a passport correctly, and assuring that the passport applicant does not steal any valuables available at the remote site. Furthermore, the mere recitation of an intended use does not make known apparatus patentable.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, Sukegawa et al., "Competing Banks," and official notice as applied to claim 3 above. Watanabe discloses an identification document data input unit for inputting the contents of an issued identification document as data (column 4, lines 30-35; column 12, lines 26-30); and discloses orchestrating, when reissuing an identification document,

the display unit and data input unit so as to amend the data required using data inputted from the identification document data input unit (column 12, line 41, through column 13, line 54).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, Sukegawa et al., "Competing Banks," and official notice as applied to claim 4 above. Watanabe discloses that an input unit reads the image of an issued identification document, and recognizes the characters in the read image in order to input the data (column 12, lines 26-30).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, Sukegawa et al., "Competing Banks," and official notice as applied to claim 3 above. Watanabe does not expressly disclose a receipt issuer unit for issuing receipt authorization data for checking an applicant when an identification document is issued to the applicant, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (column 9, lines 7-15). Neither Watanabe nor Sukegawa et al. disclose having the control unit determine whether the applied for identification document is to be issued or not by verifying the authorization in a storing unit, but official notice is taken that it is well known to provide or not provide a product or service to a customer according to whether it can be verified that he has paid for it. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to have the control unit determine whether the applied for identification document is to be issued by verifying the receipt authorization, for the obvious advantage of issuing documents to, and only to, those who have paid for them.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose issuing receipt authorization data for checking an applicant when an identification document is issued on a later day, but official notice is taken that it is well known for receipts to be used to obtain goods or services on a later day (e.g., layaway plans). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to issue receipt authorization data for checking an applicant when a passport was issued to the applicant on a later day, for the obvious advantage of easing issuance, when, for a variety of reasons, a passport could not be issued at once. (Reasons might include lack of stock of passport blanks, the need to verify certain information, or summon human beings to make sensitive decisions, etc. For that matter, the present examiner has several times in his life applied for and obtained passports, and, if his recollection serves, passports were not issued until some days after he had gone to the Post Office, paid the requisite fees, submitted photographs, etc.)

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, Sukegawa et al., "Competing Banks," and official notice as applied to claim 3 above. Watanabe does not expressly disclose that the image input unit is a digital camera, but does disclose that a CCD (charge-coupled device) rather than a conventional silver halide photographic system is used (column 15, lines 1-14). Official notice is taken that digital cameras are well known, particularly in association with CCD's; hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to use a digital

camera, for the stated advantage of taking and storing a number of shots within a short time.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, Sukegawa et al., "Competing Banks," and official notice as applied to claim 3 above. Watanabe does not disclose that the apparatus further comprises a voice outputting unit for providing guidance by voice for the transaction procedure; or that the control unit outputs messages previously prepared with voice according to the progress of the transaction procedure by controlling the voice outputting unit. However, official notice is taken that it is well known to use voice outputting units to provide guidance by voice, and to have a control unit output messages previously prepared with voice according to the progress of a procedure by controlling the voice outputting unit. (An example with which millions of people must be familiar, often to their frustration, is the kind of voicemail system in which previously prepared voice messages are outputted to the caller depending on his progress in selecting telephone buttons to press or answers to speak.) Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to have the apparatus further comprise such a voice outputting unit for providing guidance, and to output messages previously prepared with voice according to the progress of the transaction procedure, for the obvious advantages of conveniently providing instructions to people who may be imperfectly literate, providing instructions by voice to save people the trouble of attempting to read instructions while at the same time entering data, and saving the expense of a display screen as opposed to a microphone.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, Sukegawa et al., "Competing Banks," and official notice as applied to claim 3 above. Watanabe does not disclose, that the display unit is a display unit based on an integrated touch panel system, but official notice is taken that display units based on integrated touch panel systems are well known. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to employ a display unit based on an integrated touch panel system, for the obvious advantage of conveniently responding to a user's entries, and displaying appropriate instructions.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, Sukegawa et al., "Competing Banks," and official notice as applied to claim 3 above. Watanabe discloses a direct payment unit for payment of a charge for identification document transaction with cash (Figure 3, elements 69 and 70; see also column 5, lines 50-56), wherein the input of bills and change is controlled by controlling the operations of the direct payment unit (Figure 2, elements 29 and 30; column 5, lines 50-56).

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, Sukegawa et al., "Competing Banks," and official notice as applied to claim 3 above. Watanabe does not disclose that the communication unit is connected to a center of a financial institution, or that the apparatus further comprises an indirect payment unit for processing a charge for passport application through communication between the communication unit and the financial institution, but official notice is taken

that it is well known to provide indirect payment means for processing a charge through communication with a financial institution (e.g., ATM machines, apparatus for accepting credit and debit cards in many shops, etc.). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to have the apparatus further comprise an indirect payment unit, with a connection to a financial institution, for the obvious advantages of enabling document applicants to apply for identification documents without the inconvenience of carrying sufficient cash, and sparing the operators of the identification document transaction apparatus the need to deal with substantial amounts of cash.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, Sukegawa et al., "Competing Banks," and official notice as applied to claim 3 above. Watanabe discloses reading out data for issuing a certificate for the identification document applicant from the center with the communication unit (column 12, lines 53-61), and printing the certificate based on the read-out data using the printing unit (e.g., column 7, lines 20-54).

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, Sukegawa et al., "Competing Banks," and official notice as applied to claim 3 above. Watanabe discloses that a data input unit executes data input from a storage medium storing therein data required for transactions (column 12, lines 21-40).

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe (U.S. Patent 5,717,776) in view of Sukegawa et al. (U.S. Patent 5,235,165)

and "MASTERCARD: Competing Banks Collaborate during First Implementation of SET Interoperability" (hereinafter "Competing Banks"), and official notice. Watanabe discloses an identification card transaction apparatus for processing identification card transactions with a storage medium which stores the data required for issuance of identification cards and the data for identifying the applicants for the identification cards, said apparatus comprising: an image input unit for inputting an image of the applicant (column 15, lines 1-31); and a data input unit for inputting data for the application (column 15, lines 21-40). Watanabe does not expressly disclose a control unit for controlling the communications by the communication unit, image input by the image input unit, display by the display unit, data input by the data input unit, and issuance by the issuer unit, but it is held to be inherent that there must be circuitry and/or software to carry out control. Watanabe does not expressly disclose orchestrating the center so as to determine whether the applied for identification document is to be issued or not based on the identification data for the applicant which has been recorded in the resident database and on the transmitted input data, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (column 7, line 36, through column 8, line 26; see also Figure 4). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to determine whether or not the applied for identification document is to be issued or not based on the recorded identification data and the transmitted input data, for the obvious advantage of issuing identification documents to and only to the persons whom they are supposed to identify.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose a reader unit for reading out the data from the storage medium, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (element 42 in Figure 4). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to have the apparatus comprise a reader unit for reading out the data from the storage medium, for the stated advantage of extracting relevant information from the storage medium.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose a display unit for displaying a guidance for the procedure for the identification document transaction, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (Figure 7; column 3, lines 21-24; column 8, lines 27-35 et subseq.). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to include a display unit for displaying a guidance for the procedure, for the obvious advantage of making applicants more likely to carry out the procedure correctly.

Watanabe discloses a printer unit (Figure 2, element 57; see also column 5, lines 9-12). Watanabe does not expressly disclose that the printer unit prints the image inputted by the image input unit, but official notice is taken that it is well known to print images on passports, driver's licenses, passports, and other identification documents. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to print the image, for the obvious advantage of producing a photographic identification document.

Watanabe discloses an issuer unit for issuing an identification document obtained by printing with the printer unit (column 16, lines 35-39).

Watanabe does not expressly disclose that his invention is for passports, but does teach that it relates to a certification card with a certification photo, such as a driver's license or a personal identification card (column 1, lines 7-9), and passports are personal identification documents which generally contain certification photos. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to apply Watanabe's methods to producing passports.

Watanabe does not disclose that the passport transaction apparatus is connected to a financial institution such as a bank or credit card company that executes an authorization of the passport applicant, so that the passport transaction apparatus identifies the applicant based on a result of the authentication, but it is standard procedure to have purchasing apparatus connected to a financial apparatus, such as a credit card company, that executes an authentication of the applicant, so that the transaction apparatus identifies the applicant based on the result of the authentication, as taught by "Competing Banks" (especially paragraph beginning "Mr. Roland Cheung"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of patent applicant's invention to apply these standard techniques to a passport transaction apparatus in particular, for the obvious advantage of determining or verifying a passport applicant's identity.

Watanabe does not disclose that the image input unit is also used for monitoring the applicant at a remote site, but official notice is taken that it is well known to use image input units (e.g., security cameras) to monitor people remotely. Hence, it would

Art Unit: 3625

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of patent applicant's invention to have the image input unit also be used for monitoring the passport applicant at a remote site, for such obvious advantages as assisting the passport applicant in applying for a passport correctly, and assuring that the passport applicant does not steal any valuables available at the remote site. Furthermore, the mere recitation of an intended use does not make known apparatus patentable.

Claims 15 and 16 closely parallel claims 4 and 5, respectively, and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the same grounds.

Claim 17 closely parallels claim 6, and is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the same grounds.

Claim 18 closely parallels claim 7, and is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the same grounds.

Claims 19, 20, 21, and 22 closely parallel claims 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the same grounds.

Claim 23 closely parallels claim 12, and is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the same grounds.

Claim 24 closely parallels claim 13, and is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the same grounds.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, Sukegawa, and "Competing Banks" as applied to claim 14 above. Watanabe discloses that data is read from an IC card (column 5, lines 57-65).

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe (U.S. Patent 5,717,776) in view of Sukegawa et al. (U.S. Patent 5,235,165), and "MASTERCARD: Competing Banks Collaborate during First Implementation of SET Interoperability" (hereinafter "Competing Banks"), and official notice. Watanabe discloses an identification document transaction method applicable to a system in which a system is connected via communication line to a center for providing data for issuance of a certificate to an applicant and executing examination for issuance of an identification document for processing identification card transactions via communication with the center, said method comprising: inputting data for checking an applicant (column 12, lines 21-40); inputting, when it is determined that the applied for identification document is to be issued, an image of the applicant (column 15, lines 1-31); and printing the image of the applicant and the contents of a description onto paper previously prepared, and issuing the identification document thus obtained by printing (column 2, lines 49-63). Watanabe does not expressly and unambiguously disclose accessing the center and determining whether the applied for identification document is to be issued or not by using data inputted for checking on an applicant, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (column 7, line 36, through column 8, line 26; see also Figure 4). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to determine whether or not the applied for identification document is to be issued according to the data read out, for the obvious advantage of issuing identification documents to and only to the persons whom they are supposed to identify.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose that his invention is for passports, but does teach that it relates to a certification card with a certification photo, such as a driver's license or a personal identification card (column 1, lines 7-9), and passports are personal identification documents which generally contain certification photos. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to apply Watanabe's methods to producing passports.

Watanabe does not disclose that the passport transaction apparatus is connected to a financial institution such as a bank or credit card company that executes an authorization of the passport applicant, so that the passport transaction apparatus identifies the applicant based on a result of the authentication, but it is standard procedure to have purchasing apparatus connected to a financial apparatus, such as a credit card company, that executes an authentication of the applicant, so that the transaction apparatus identifies the applicant based on the result of the authentication, as taught by "Competing Banks" (especially paragraph beginning "Mr. Roland Cheung"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of patent applicant's invention to apply these standard techniques to a passport transaction apparatus in particular, for the obvious advantage of determining or verifying a passport applicant's identity.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose monitoring an applicant, but official notice is taken that it is well known to monitor people. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of patent applicant's invention to monitor a

passport applicant, for such obvious advantages as assisting the passport applicant in applying for a passport correctly, and assuring that the passport applicant does not steal any valuables available at the remote site.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe (U.S. Patent 5,717,776) in view of Sukegawa et al. (U.S. Patent 5,235,165), "MASTERCARD: Competing Banks Collaborate during First Implementation of SET Interoperability" (hereinafter "Competing Banks"), and official notice. Watanabe discloses an identification document transaction method applicable for processing identification document transactions with a storage medium storing therein data required for issuance of identification documents as well as data for identifying applications for passports comprising: reading out data required for issuance of an identification document from the storage medium and data for identifying an applicant (column 12, lines 21-40); inputting, when it is determined that the applied for identification document is to be issued, an image of the applicant (column 15, lines 1-31); and printing the inputted image of the applicant and the contents of a description of the applicant onto paper previously prepared, and issuing the printed identification document (column 2, lines 49-63). Watanabe does not expressly and unambiguously disclose determining whether the applied for identification document is to be issued or not by using data inputted for checking on an applicant, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (column 7, line 36, through column 8, line 26; see also Figure 4). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at

the time of applicant's invention to determine whether or not the applied for identification document is to be issued according to the data read out, for the obvious advantage of issuing identification documents to and only to the persons whom they are supposed to identify.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose that his invention is for passports, but does teach that it relates to a certification card with a certification photo, such as a driver's license or a personal identification card (column 1, lines 7-9), and passports are personal identification documents which generally contain certification photos. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to apply Watanabe's methods to producing passports.

Watanabe does not disclose that the passport transaction apparatus is connected to a financial institution such as a bank or credit card company that executes an authorization of the passport applicant, and that the passport transaction apparatus identifies the applicant based on a result of the authentication, but it is standard procedure to have purchasing apparatus connected to a financial apparatus, such as a credit card company, that executes an authentication of the applicant, and that the transaction apparatus identifies the applicant based on the result of the authentication, as taught by "Competing Banks" (see especially paragraph beginning "Mr. Roland Cheung"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of patent applicant's invention to apply

these standard techniques to a passport transaction apparatus in particular, for the obvious advantage of determining or verifying a passport applicant's identity.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose monitoring an applicant, but official notice is taken that it is well known to monitor people. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of patent applicant's invention to monitor a passport applicant, for such obvious advantages as assisting the passport applicant in applying for a passport correctly, and assuring that the passport applicant does not steal any valuables available at the remote site.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe (U.S. Patent 5,717,776) in view of Sukegawa et al. (U.S. Patent 5,235,165), Bradley et al. (U.S. Patent 5,771,071), "MASTERCARD: Competing Banks Collaborate during First Implementation of SET Interoperability" (hereinafter "Competing Banks"), and official notice. Watanabe discloses an identification document transaction system comprising: a center for executing examination for issuance of identification documents (Figure 2). Watanabe discloses that the center is connected to a first database storing therein data for issuing certificates to applicants (column 12, lines 31-61). Watanabe does not disclose registering data for issuance of identification documents in a second database, but Bradley et al. teach this (column 1, lines 60-66). Furthermore, the duplication of known parts for a multiple effect is held to be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art [*St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8, 11; 549 F.2d 833 (7th Cir 1977); *In re Harza*, 124 USPQ 378, 380; 274 F.2d 669 (CCPA 1960)], from

which the use of two databases is held to be obvious. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to connect the center accessibly to first and second databases, for the obvious advantages of enabling the system to access data useful in determining whether to issue an identification document or not, and enabling the system to make records of identification document issuance data, so it will be possible to know how many identification documents have been issued, to whom they have been issued, and to obtain information about the persons to who they have been issued.

Watanabe discloses at least one passport transaction apparatus connected via a communication line to said center for processing identification document transactions by communicating with said center, wherein said identification document transaction apparatus comprises a communication unit for communicating with said center (column 12, lines 31-33); an image input unit for inputting an image of the applicant for an identification document (column 15, lines 1-31). Watanabe does not expressly disclose a control unit for controlling the communications by the communication unit, image input by the image input unit, display by the display unit, data input by the data input unit, and issuance by the issuer unit, but it is held to be inherent that there must be circuitry and/or software to carry out control. Watanabe does not expressly disclose a control section for controlling the input, display, and communications of each of the units to the center using the communication unit, but it is held to be inherent that there must be circuitry and/or software to carry this out. Watanabe does not expressly disclose making the center determine whether the applied for identification document is to be

issued or not based on the identification data for the applicant which has been recorded in the resident database and in the transmitted data, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (column 7, line 36, through column 8, line 26; see also Figure 4). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to determine whether or not the applied for identification document is to be issued or not based on the recorded identification data and the transmitted input data, for the obvious advantage of issuing identification documents to and only to the persons whom they are supposed to identify.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose a display unit for displaying a guidance for the procedure for the identification document transaction, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (Figure 7; column 3, lines 21-24; column 8, lines 27-35 et subseq.). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to include a display unit for displaying a guidance for the procedure, for the obvious advantage of making applicants more likely to carry out the procedure correctly.

Watanabe discloses a printer unit (Figure 2, element 57; see also column 5, lines 9-12). Watanabe does not expressly disclose that the printer unit prints the image inputted by the image input unit, but official notice is taken that it is well known to print images on passports, driver's licenses, passports, and other identification documents. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to print the image, for the obvious advantage of producing a photographic identification document.

Watanabe discloses an issuer unit for issuing an identification document obtained by printing with the printer unit (column 16, lines 35-39).

Watanabe does not expressly disclose that his invention is for passports, but does teach that it relates to a certification card with a certification photo, such as a driver's license or a personal identification card (column 1, lines 7-9), and passports are personal identification documents which generally contain certification photos. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to apply Watanabe's methods to producing passports.

Watanabe does not disclose that the passport transaction apparatus is connected to a financial institution such as a bank or credit card company that executes an authorization of the passport applicant, so that the passport transaction apparatus identifies the applicant based on a result of the authentication, but it is standard procedure to have purchasing apparatus connected to a financial apparatus, such as a credit card company, that executes an authentication of the applicant, so that the transaction apparatus identifies the applicant based on the result of the authentication, as taught by "Competing Banks" (see especially paragraph beginning "Mr. Roland Cheung"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of patent applicant's invention to apply these standard techniques to a passport transaction apparatus in particular, for the obvious advantage of determining or verifying a passport applicant's identity.

Watanabe does not disclose that the image input unit is [also] for monitoring applicants, but official notice is taken that it is well known to use image input units (e.g., security cameras) to monitor people remotely. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of patent applicant's invention to have the image input unit also be for monitoring passport applicants, for such obvious advantages as assisting the passport applicants in applying for a passport correctly, and assuring that the passport applicants do not steal any valuables available at the site. Furthermore, the mere recitation of an intended use does not make known apparatus patentable.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, Sukegawa et al., Bradley et al., "Competing Banks," and official notice as applied to claim 28 above. Watanabe discloses transmitting images to a file server, and storing them therein (column 15, lines 20-35; see also column 4, lines 36-42); thus the image input unit and communication unit are connected to each other, and the control unit transfers the image inputted by the image input unit via the communication unit to the center.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, Sukegawa et al., Bradley et al., "Competing Banks," and official notice as applied to claim 28 above. Watanabe does not expressly disclose a voice inputting unit and voice outputting unit, nor does Watanabe disclose that the communication unit transfers the voice inputted with the voice input unit to the center and also outputs the voice transferred from the center to the voice outputting unit. However, official notice is

taken that voice inputting and voice outputting units are well known, and further, that it is well known to transfer voices from one location to another. (Telephones are the obvious example of apparatus for doing so, and telephones, of course, also include voice input and output units.) Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include voice input and output units, and to transfer voices to and from the center, for the obvious advantage of facilitating communications between a remote user and the center.

Claims 31 and 32 closely parallel claims 10 and 11, respectively, and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the same grounds.

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe (U.S. Patent 5,717,776) in view of Sukegawa et al. (U.S. Patent 5,235,165), Bradley et al. (U.S. Patent 4,771,071), "MASTERCARD: Competing Banks Collaborate during First Implementation of SET Interoperability" (hereinafter "Competing Banks"), and official notice. Watanabe discloses an identification document transaction system comprising: a first center having a first database with data required for issuance of identification documents (Figure 2; column 12, lines 31-61). Watanabe does not disclose a second center for registering data for issuance of identification documents in a second database and also executing examination for issuance of passports, but Bradley et al. teach such a database (column 1, lines 60-66). Furthermore, the duplication of known parts for a multiple effect is held to be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art [*St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8, 11; 549 F2d

833 (7th Cir 1977); *In re Harza*, 124 USPQ 378, 380; 274 F.2d 669 (CCPA 1960)], from which the use of two centers is held to be obvious. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to include first and second centers with corresponding databases, for the obvious advantages of enabling the system to access data useful in determining whether to issue an identification document or not, and enabling the system to make records of identification document issuance data, so it will be possible to know how many identification documents have been issued, to whom they have been issued, and to obtain information about the persons to who they have been issued.

Watanabe discloses at least one passport transaction apparatus connected via a communication line to a center for processing identification document transactions by communicating with the center, wherein said identification document transaction apparatus comprises a communication unit for communicating with said center (column 12, lines 31-33); an image input unit for inputting an image of the applicant for an identification document (column 15, lines 1-31). Watanabe does not expressly disclose a control unit for controlling the communications by the communication unit, image input by the image input unit, display by the display unit, data input by the data input unit, and issuance by the issuer unit, but it is held to be inherent that there must be circuitry and/or software to carry out control. Watanabe does not expressly disclose orchestrating the center so as to determine whether the applied for identification document is to be issued or not based on the identification data for the applicant which has been recorded in the resident database and on the transmitted input data, but

Sukegawa et al. teach this (column 7, line 36, through column 8, line 26; see also Figure 4). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to determine whether or not the applied for identification document is to be issued or not based on the recorded identification data and the transmitted input data, for the obvious advantage of issuing identification documents to and only to the persons whom they are supposed to identify.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose a display unit for displaying a guidance for the procedure for the identification document transaction, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (Figure 7; column 3, lines 21-24; column 8, lines 27-35 et subseq.). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to include a display unit for displaying a guidance for the procedure, for the obvious advantage of making applicants more likely to carry out the procedure correctly.

Watanabe discloses a printer unit (Figure 2, element 57; see also column 5, lines 9-12). Watanabe does not expressly disclose that the printer unit prints the image inputted by the image input unit, but official notice is taken that it is well known to print images on passports, driver's licenses, passports, and other identification documents. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to print the image, for the obvious advantage of producing a photographic identification document.

Watanabe discloses an issuing unit for issuing an identification document obtained by printing with the printer unit (column 16, lines 35-39).

Watanabe does not expressly disclose that the first center verifies the data inputted by the data input unit according to a request for verification of an applicant for an identification document from the identification document transaction apparatus to the first database by way of communication with the communication unit and returns a reply according to a result of verification as to whether the applicant is the person he claims to be or not, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (column 7, line 36, through column 8, line 26; note also elements 10 and in particular 3 in Figure 1). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to have the first center verify the data in such a manner, for the obvious advantage of determining whether an identification document applicant is the person he claims to be.

Watanabe does not disclose that a second center verifies the data inputted by the input center, etc., but, as stated above, in the first paragraph of this rejection, the duplication of known parts to obtain a multiple effect is held to be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose that his invention is for passports, but does teach that it relates to a certification card with a certification photo, such as a driver's license or a personal identification card (column 1, lines 7-9), and passports are personal identification documents which generally contain certification photos. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document

preparation at the time of applicant's invention to apply Watanabe's methods to producing passports.

Watanabe does not disclose that the passport transaction apparatus is connected to a financial institution such as a bank or credit card company that executes an authorization of the passport applicant, so that the passport transaction apparatus identifies the applicant based on a result of the authentication, but it is standard procedure to have purchasing apparatus connected to a financial apparatus, such as a credit card company, that executes an authentication of the applicant, so that the transaction apparatus identifies the applicant based on the result of the authentication, as taught by "Competing Banks" (see especially paragraph beginning "Mr. Roland Cheung"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of patent applicant's invention to apply these standard techniques to a passport transaction apparatus in particular, for the obvious advantage of determining or verifying a passport applicant's identity.

Watanabe does not disclose that the image input unit is [also] is for monitoring the applicant, but official notice is taken that it is well known to use image input units (e.g., security cameras) to monitor people. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of patent applicant's invention to have the image input unit also be used for monitoring passport applicants at a remote site, for such obvious advantages as assisting a passport applicant in applying for a passport correctly, and assuring that the passport applicant does not steal any valuables available at the

remote site. Furthermore, the mere recitation of an intended use does not make known apparatus patentable.

Claim 34 is closely parallel to claim 29, and is therefore rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the same grounds.

Claim 35 is closely parallel to claim 30, and is therefore rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the same grounds.

Claims 36 and 37 closely parallel claims 10 and 11, respectively, and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the same grounds.

Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe (U.S. Patent 5,717,776) in view of Sukegawa et al. (U.S. Patent 5,235,165), Nakamura et al. (U.S. Patent 4,068,213), and official notice. Watanabe discloses an identification document transaction apparatus that communicates with at least one host computer which handles issuance of identification documents, said apparatus comprising: a communication unit for communicating with an appropriate computer (column 12, lines 31-33; see also Figure 10A); an image input unit for inputting an image of the applicant for an identification document (column 15, lines 1-31); and a data input unit that inputs data required in a procedure of the filing (column 15, lines 21-40).

Watanabe does not expressly disclose a display unit for displaying a guidance for filing an application for an identification document transaction, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (Figure 7; column 3, lines 21-24; column 8, lines 27-35 et subseq.). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document

preparation at the time of applicant's invention to include a display unit for displaying a guidance for the filing an application, for the obvious advantage of making applicants more likely to carry out the procedure correctly.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose a signature input unit for inputting a signature as data, but official notice is taken that it is well known to use signature input units for inputting a signature of as data. (For example, Examiner inputted his signature into such a unit to have a reproduction of his signature printed on his Virginia driver's license.) Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to include such a signature input unit, for the obvious advantage of obtaining the identification document applicant's signature for the identification document and/or for issuer's records.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose a control section that controls the communication unit, the image input unit, the display unit, the data input unit, and the signature input unit, but it is held to be inherent that there must be circuitry and/or software to carry this out.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose that his invention is for passports, but does teach that it relates to a certification card with a certification photo, such as a driver's license or a personal identification card (column 1, lines 7-9), and passports are personal identification documents which generally contain certification photos. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to apply Watanabe's methods to producing passports.

Watanabe does not disclose that the data required in the procedure of the filing includes a PIN of an applicant for the passport, the control section communicates with a first host computer and a third host computer through the communication unit so as to identify the applicant based on a result of authentication by the PIN, so as to carry out a procedure for payment from an account specified by the PIN, but Nakamura teaches requiring a PIN of a purchaser, communicating with a computer so as to identify the purchase based on a result of authenticating the PIN, and so as to carry out a procedure for payment from an account specified by the PIN (column 1, line 65, through column 2, line 36; column 4, line 46, through column 5, line 5; column 5, line 57, through column 6, line 11). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of patent applicant's invention to apply these standard authentication and payment techniques to a passport transaction apparatus in particular, for the obvious advantages of verifying a passport applicant's identity and obtaining payment of passport application fees.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe (U.S. Patent 5,717,776) in view of Sukegawa et al. (U.S. Patent 5,235,165), Nakamura et al. (U.S. Patent 4,068,213), and official notice. Watanabe discloses an identification document transaction apparatus that communicates with at least one host computer which handles issuance of identification documents, said apparatus comprising: a communication unit that communicates with an appropriate computer (column 12, lines 31-33; see also Figure 10A); an image input unit for inputting an

image of the applicant for an identification document (column 15, lines 1-31); and a data input unit that inputs data required in a procedure of the filing (column 15, lines 21-40).

Watanabe does not expressly disclose a display unit for displaying a guidance for filing an application for an identification document transaction, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (Figure 7; column 3, lines 21-24; column 8, lines 27-35 et subseq.). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to include a display unit for displaying a guidance for the filing an application, for the obvious advantage of making applicants more likely to carry out the procedure correctly.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose a signature input unit for inputting a signature as data, but official notice is taken that it is well known to use signature input units for inputting a signature of as data. (For example, Examiner inputted his signature into such a unit to have a reproduction of his signature printed on his Virginia driver's license.) Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to include such a signature input unit, for the obvious advantage of obtaining the identification document applicant's signature for the identification document and/or for issuer's records.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose a control section that controls the communication unit, the image input unit, the display unit, the data input unit, and the signature input unit, but it is held to be inherent that there must be circuitry and/or software to carry this out.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose that his invention is for passports, but does teach that it relates to a certification card with a certification photo, such as a driver's license or a personal identification card (column 1, lines 7-9), and passports are personal identification documents which generally contain certification photos. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to apply Watanabe's methods to producing passports.

Watanabe does not disclose that the data required in the procedure of the filing includes a PIN of an applicant for the passport, the control section communicates with a second host computer and a third host computer through the first computer, the control section transmits the PIN to the first host computer through the communication unit so as to identify the applicant based on a result of authentication by the PIN, so as to carry out a procedure for payment from an account specified by the PIN, but Nakamura teaches requiring a PIN of a purchaser, communicating with a computer corresponding to the third host computer so as to identify the purchaser according to the PIN, and so as to carry out a procedure for payment from an account specified by the PIN (column 1, line 65, through column 2, line 36; column 4, line 46, through column 5, line 5; column 5, line 57, through column 6, line 11), while Sukegawa teaches communicating with a database corresponding to the second host computer through a control section (column 7, line 36, through column 8, line 26; see also Figures 1 and 4). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of patent applicant's invention to apply these standard authentication and

payment techniques to a passport transaction apparatus in particular, for the obvious advantages of verifying a passport applicant's identity and obtaining payment of passport application fees.

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe (U.S. Patent 5,717,776) in view of Sukegawa et al. (U.S. Patent 5,235,165), and official notice. Watanabe discloses an identification document transaction apparatus connected to a residents database storing therein identification data of the residents and also connected to a center which executes an examination for issuance of identification documents through a communication line, said apparatus comprising: a communication unit for communicating with said center (column 12, lines 31-33; see also Figure 10A); an image input unit for inputting an image of the applicant for an identification document (column 15, lines 1-31); and a data input unit for inputting data for the application (column 15, lines 21-40).

Watanabe does not expressly disclose a display unit for displaying a guidance for the procedure for the identification document transaction, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (Figure 7; column 3, lines 21-24; column 8, lines 27-35 et subseq.). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to include a display unit for displaying a guidance for the procedure, for the obvious advantage of making applicants more likely to carry out the procedure correctly.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose a control section for transmitting the data inputted by each of the input units to the center using the communication unit, but it is held to be inherent that there must be circuitry and/or software to carry this out.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose making the center determine whether the applied for identification document is to be issued or not based on the identification data for the applicant which has been recorded in the resident database and in the transmitted data, but Sukegawa et al. teach this (column 7, line 36, through column 8, line 26; see also Figure 4). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to determine whether or not the applied for identification document is to be issued or not based on the recorded identification data and the transmitted input data, for the obvious advantage of issuing identification documents to and only to the persons whom they are supposed to identify.

Watanabe does not expressly disclose that his invention is for passports, but does teach that it relates to a certification card with a certification photo, such as a driver's license or a personal identification card (column 1, lines 7-9), and passports are personal identification documents which generally contain certification photos. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of identification document preparation at the time of applicant's invention to apply Watanabe's methods to producing passports.

Watanabe does not disclose that the image input unit is [also] used for monitoring an applicant/monitoring the applicant [at a remote site], but official notice is

taken that it is well known to use image input units (e.g., security cameras) to monitor people remotely. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of patent applicant's invention to have the image input unit also be used for monitoring the passport applicant at a remote site, for such obvious advantages as assisting the passport applicant in applying for a passport correctly, and assuring that the passport applicant does not steal any valuables available at the remote site. Furthermore, the mere recitation of an intended use does not make known apparatus patentable.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed June 19, 2003, have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the newly claimed feature of monitoring the passport applicants is not disclosed in any of the previously cited references; Examiner replies that it is nonetheless believed to be obvious, as set forth in the claim rejections, above. It can scarcely be maintained that monitoring people using cameras is novel, and in any case, a mere recitation of intended purpose in method claims does not make known apparatus patentable.

Applicant argues that the Nakamura does not disclose connecting to a financial institution which executes an authentication of the purchaser/passport applicant. Without conceding that Nakamura does not disclose this, Examiner has instead relied on the article, "MASTERCARD: Competing Banks Collaborate during First Implementation of SET Interoperability" (hereinafter "Competing Banks"), which more

clearly sets forth such authentication (except in the rejections of claims 38 and 39, which recite notably different claim limitations).

Regarding claims 38 and 39 in particular, Applicant argues that Examiner has failed to rely on any of the applied references for certain features of the claims, relating to use of a PIN number, but has merely concluded that the features in question are obvious. Examiner replies that far from merely asserting the features in dispute to be obvious, he has relied upon the teachings of Nakamura (in claim 38), and Nakamura together with Sukegawa (in claim 39) to reject the PIN-related limitations which Applicant describes as being rejected on a mere assertion, as may readily be verified by reading the rejections in question.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Nama (U.S. Patent 4,991,008) discloses an automatic transaction surveillance system. Samph et al. (U.S. Patent 5,195,033) disclose a testing system including removable storage means for transfer of test related data and means for issuing a certification upon successful completion of the test (and a camera monitor for obtaining images of test-takers). South et al. (U.S. Patent 5,921,523) disclose a mount for a camera-PC terminal.

Kido et al. (Japanese Published Patent Application 3-149662) disclose visual acuity inspector and driver's license delivering systems. Yui (Japanese Published

Art Unit: 3625

Patent Application 9-198538) discloses entrance and exit management terminal equipment.

Ferris (American Banker article) discloses actions of various financial institutions regarding ATM and point-of-sale networks.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas D. Rosen, whose telephone number is 703-305-0753. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wynn Coggins, can be reached on 703-308-1344. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-305-7687 for regular communications and for After Final communications (soon to be superseded by 703-872-9306).

The new mailing address for the Patent Office is:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria VA 22313-1450

As of May 1, 2003, the former addresses, Washington DC 20231 and P.O. Box 2327 Arlington VA 22202, should **not** be used.

Papers can be hand-delivered to the Technology Center 3600 receptionist, 7th floor, Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington VA 22202.

Art Unit: 3625

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

Nicholas D. Rosen
NICHOLAS D. ROSEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

August 7, 2003